

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are pending. Claims 1, 2, and 6 have been amended. Claims 7-16 have been cancelled as being drawn to a non-elected invention and without prejudice or disclaimer as to Applicants' right to pursue the subject matter of these claims in a continuing application. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application based on the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 2 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants have amended claims 2 and 6 to correct the informalities in claims 2 and 6 that were identified by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Park et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,960,971). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites, in part, a self-sustaining center-anchor microelectromechanical switch that includes ground lines formed at both sides of the transmission lines, a dielectric-moving plate formed over the substrate and including a switching unit that electrically connects the transmission line during short-circuit operation, anchors having a self-sustaining center-anchor formed on the center of the transmission lines to support the dielectric-moving plate to the substrate, and upper electrodes located in an upper portion of the dielectric-moving plate different than where the switching unit is located and serving as a driving electrode to the ground line.

In contrast, Park discloses contact lines 32a and 32b, electrodes 40 and a beam 60. See, Figures 7 and 8a. The Office Action, on pages 3 and 4, alleges that the electrodes 40 are analogous to the ground lines recited in claim 1 and further alleges that the electrodes 40 are formed on both sides of the transmission lines, as recited in claim 1. However, Park merely discloses that the electrodes 40 are formed on both sides of one of the contact lines, specifically, line 32a. Park does not teach or suggest forming the electrodes 40 on both sides of the transmission lines, as recited in claim 1.

Additionally, Park fails to disclose anchors having a self-sustaining center-anchor formed on the center of the transmission lines, as recited in claim 1. Specifically, the Office Action alludes to spacers 20, but spacers 20 in Park are not formed on the center of the transmission

lines (see e.g., center anchor 110 in Figure 5 of Applicants disclosure as distinguished from anchors 112 and 113.).

Furthermore, Park does not disclose a dielectric-moving plate including a switching unit and an upper electrode located in a portion of the dielectric moving pate different than where the switching unit is located. Specifically, in the Office Action, the Examiner refers to beam 60 as being analogous to both the switching unit and the the upper electrode recited in claim 1. However, as recited in claim 1, the upper electrode and the switching unit are distinct. Therefore, it is improper to allege that the same beam 60 is anagous to both structures of the present invention. See, for example, Applicants' Figures 6A and 6B which include the upper electrode 140 and the switching unit 141. There is no such analogous teaching in Park.

Accordingly, Park fails to teach, or even suggest, a self-sustaining center-anchor microelectromechanical switch that includes ground lines formed at both sides of the transmission lines, a dielectric-moving plate formed over the substrate and including a switching unit that electrically connects the transmission line during short-circuit operation, anchors having a self-sustaining center-anchor formed on the center of the transmission lines to support the dielectric-moving plate to the substrate, and upper electrodes located in an upper portion of the dielectric-moving plate different than where the switching unit is located and serving as a driving electrode to the ground line, as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 3-5 contained allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the features of their base and any intervening claims. However, in view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claim (claims 1-6) are allowable.

Conclusion

Therefore, all objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicants at the telephone number indicated below in order to expeditiously resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

MAYER BROWN ROWE & MAW LLP

By:



Yoon S. Ham
Registration No. 45,307
Direct No. (202) 263-3280

YSH/VVK

Intellectual Property Group
1909 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-1101
(202) 263-3000 Telephone
(202) 263-3300 Facsimile

Date: February 23, 2006